

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 13 and 14 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections due to typographical errors. Applicants have amended these claims to correct typographical errors. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 5-7 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The specification is objected to due to a requested updating of a filing date of a referenced application. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claims 1-14 and 19-20 are objected to due to informalities. Applicants have corrected the typographical errors in these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite as allegedly not being understood. Applicants have corrected a typographical error in claim 18 and respectfully submit that this claim is not indefinite as written. For example, the claim refers to device editing rights stored on a mobile terminal or device editing rights received in connection with digital broadcast content wherein the digital editing rights are used to determine whether an editing operation to a selected digital broadcast content is allowed. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference (Ng et al.) does not teach or suggest this subject matter and as such, this claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ng et al. (U.S. 2003/0204850 A1). The Ng reference is directed to a completely different system and operation from that claimed by Applicants. For example, the Ng system does not appear to be

directed to any kind of a mobile terminal devices that, for example, utilize digital broadcast content for instance, but instead refers to a cinema content distribution system that utilizes a live event director hub system for receiving and combining transmitted live video source information and retransmitting the live video source information for exhibition to exhibition sites. All final editing of the overall transmission takes place at the single live event director system (paragraph 17). The live event director system serves as a type of hub for a plurality of simultaneous live source streams. In contrast, claim 19, for example, requires, among other things, a mobile terminal that wirelessly sends one of at least digital broadcast content capture commands or editing commands. The office action does not cite any portion of the Ng reference that teaches such a mobile terminal and as such, the claim is in condition for allowance for this reason alone.

Moreover, the claim requires using digital rights management data for capturing or editing by a network element that receives digital broadcast content based on the received content capture commands or editing commands. Again, Applicants are unable to find in the rejection any reference to the digital rights management data as claimed nor a network element that receives digital broadcast content capture commands or editing commands sent by the mobile terminal unit. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 is also allowable as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For example, the method requires converting the received digital broadcast content to a lower bandwidth coded information stream for communication to a mobile terminal. The office action cites paragraph 52 for teaching this claimed subject matter. However, paragraph 52 is referring to the live event director system which can receive low resolution information from live event sites. There is no conversion of a received digital broadcast content to a lower bandwidth for communication to a mobile terminal. To the contrary, it appears that the lower bandwidth

information in Ng et al. is sent to the live event director hub system, which is not a mobile terminal. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance for at least this reason.

Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng et al. As noted above, the Ng reference appears to be silent as to utilizing digital broadcast content by a mobile terminal. For example, claim 1 requires, among other things, receiving the digital broadcast content by a mobile terminal, yet the Ng reference does not appear to teach or suggest such an operation nor does the office action appear to address this language. In fact, Ng et al. does not appear to use the word “mobile” since it deals with a fixed hub based retransmission system. Accordingly, this claim is in condition for allowance.

In addition, the claim requires recording of the digital broadcast content and editing, through the mobile terminal, the selected digital broadcast content, based on digital rights management data. Again, there is no teaching of any editing through a mobile terminal in the cited reference. In fact, the only editing described in the cited reference appears to be done by the live event director hub system and even this system does not appear to edit any information based on digital rights management data. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. For example, Applicants’ claim requires recording the digital content and then editing based on digital rights management. As such, the digital rights management rules are applied before the editing. Ng does not appear to teach or suggest such an operation.

The dependent claims are also allowable as adding novel and non-obvious subject matter.

In addition, as to claim 10, there is no teaching or suggestion of a copyright processor which detects whether the digital broadcast content can be copied based on digital rights management data and there does not appear to be any cite in the Ng reference in the office action for this language. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. In addition, there is no broadcast content editor that receives editing commands from a mobile terminal that edits

preconverted digital broadcast content to produce edited digital broadcast content based on the digital rights management data nor does the synchronization logic as claimed. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 15 is directed to a wireless mobile terminal with copyright processor and broadcast content editor as claimed. The office action does not cite any structure in the Ng reference that corresponds to this language apparently because it does not appear to be taught or suggested in the Ng reference. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. For example, there is no mobile terminal that includes a broadcast content editor that can produce edited digital broadcast content based on digital rights management data as claimed. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

If the rejections are maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing as to the paragraph number of the teachings that correspond to the relevant claim limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug. 10, 2005

By: C. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005